

The importance of this reference to the O'Neill-Sibert reports is in

_____, which refers to a "communication" from them the day they left the Navy Hospital after the President's body was turned over to the ~~funeral~~ undertaker. Defenders of the government and of the autopsy say the O'Neill-Sibert reports were not written until several days later, then they had forgotten or just erred. This fictitious defense was made necessary by their observations that refute the basic conclusions of the autopsy. Document 5 proves there was earlier "communication" from them which the FBI, apparently, has seen to it no longer exists. The other parts of this letter deal with what I discuss and present in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. Reference to the printed transcript of the testimony of Helen Markham are to my discovery that this transcript makes it appear that Mrs. Markham was afraid not of being charged with perjury but of being on TV with the President of the United States! Even for Mrs. Markham, this is too much to believe. WW, p _____

The last paragraph seems to say that the missing original notes of the autopsy, which Mark Lane and others erroneously report were burned but were actually entered into evidence as part of Exhibit 397, had still not been delivered to the archives, as required. ~~xx~~

The most casual examination of the cavalier letter by J. Lee Rankin, who had actually run the Commission, shows the need for impartial examination of Mrs. Kennedy's testimony about the wounds, which is still suppressed. How they looked to her, which also includes where they were, the direction of motion hence of the shots, how many impacts she saw, etc., is exactly what must be checked on for she was the only close eyewitness in the world. To say,

as Rankin does, that there is "ample evidence" in the other testimony is to say that the government will not permit its very dubious and contradictory evidence to be examined. It is exactly the testimony Rankin cites that is being questioned. It cannot therefore be invoked as defense of itself. There is also the testimony of those witnesses not used that bears of this, and these contradict the official account and Rankin. For example, those witnesses who saw the President's head snap in the wrong direction if the fatal shot was from the back were never put on the stand, statements about it were never taken from them. The government's intent here and what it accomplished is the suppression of essential testimony that could be used against its untenable conclusions. It is not the function of an honest and impartial investigation to rife out what may contradict it on the ground that disproof "could contribute nothing". This is the function and purpose of cross examination and a lawyer on the other side.

In plain English, Rankin here says I judge myself, I decide what I want and anyone who disagrees with me can go to.....